REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 9, 10, 12-16 and 18-27 are now present in the application. Claims 9, 21 and 27 have been amended. Claims 28 and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 9 and 27 are independent. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, in which the Examiner's helpful suggestions have been followed, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, claim 21 is now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei, U.S. Patent No. 5,682,043 (hereinafter Pei), in view of Wright, U.S. Patent No. 3,661,081 (hereinafter Wright), and Shinoda et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,674,553 (hereinafter Shinoda); Ireton, U.S. Patent No. 4,611,539 was cited as evidence. Claims 13, 16, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of

Wright and Shinoda, and further in view of Himeshima et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,592,933 Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being (hereinafter Himeshima). unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright and Shinoda, and further in view of Mourrellone, U.S. Patent No. 4,542,693 (hereinafter Mourrellone). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright and Shinoda, and further in view of Nagayama et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,701,055 (hereinafter Nagayama). Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright and Shinoda, and further in view of Watanabe et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,270,846 (hereinafter Watanabe). Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright and Shinoda, and further in view of Samworth, U.S. Patent No. 6,213,018 (hereinafter Samworth). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 9 and 27 have been amended to recite a combination of steps including "forming barrier ribs... for preventing spread of the electroluminescent material, each barrier rib having an upper portion" and "the upper portions of the barrier ribs are in contact with the pixel electrodes and the electroluminescent material on the pixel electrodes." Support for the above combination of steps can be found in FIGs. 11A-D as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of steps set forth in amended claims 9 and 27 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Docket No.: 2658-0234P

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Pei and Wright fail to teach forming any

barrier ribs. Although Shinoda in FIG. 20 discloses that the barriers 29 are in contact with the

phosphor layer 28, they are not in contact with the address electrode 22. Although Himeshima in

FIG. 14 discloses that the spacers 3 are in contact with the pixel electrode 2, they are not in

contact with the emitting layer 6. Therefore, Shinoda and Himeshima fail to teach that the upper

portions of the barriers 29 and the spacers 3 are in contact with both the pixel electrode and the

electroluminescent material. Accordingly Shinoda and Himeshima fail to teach "the upper

portions of the barrier ribs are in contact with the pixel electrodes and the electroluminescent

material on the pixel electrodes" as recited in amended independent claims 9 and 27.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Nagayama, Mourrellone, Watanabe and

Samworth, these references also fail to disclose the above-noted features as set forth in

independent claims 9 and 27. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of the

combination of Pei, Wright, Shinoda and Himeshima.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in

combination teach or suggest the above-noted features of independent claims 9 and 27.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 27 and their dependent

claims (at least due to their dependency) clearly define over the teachings of these references

utilized by the Examiner.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2006

Docket No.: 2658-0234P

Page 10 of 10

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: JULY 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

al